

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 47-59 are allowable in addition to claims 24-42, which the Examiner previously indicated as being allowable. However, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In Applicant's previously filed response of May 22, 2007, Applicant amended independent claim 43 to more particularly describe that the browser is able to retrieve first content from the server "simultaneously" with further content linked to the first content by making a request generated by the browser. In the outstanding Office Action of July 26, 2007, the Examiner maintained her rejection of claims 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0032254 (Hawkins).

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Hawkins teaches retrieving first content from a server simultaneously with further content linked to the first content, i.e., "server 180 transmits a typical page of web content to the wireless communication device 100 in roughly 500 bytes... most web pages have lots of formatting information, hot links and images..." (*See, e.g.,* paragraph [0089] of Hawkins). Additionally, the Examiner indicated that the hot links described in Hawkins were interpreted to read, in her opinion, on the claimed "further content linked" recited in claims 43 of the present application. The Examiner further indicated that a hot link is a linking of information in two documents so that modification of the information in the source document results in the same change in the destination document.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's understanding of Hawkins and the alleged characteristics of a "hot link." In particular, Applicant submits that a "hot link" as described in Hawkins merely comprises another URL hyperlink. That is, paragraph [0380] of Hawkins states that:

A typical web document has numerous hot links that can be clicked on to bring the user to another document on the web, or to another scroll position within the same document. Each hot link, especially the ones that bring the user to another document on the web, can easily take up 100 bytes or more in the web document. For example, a link that brings a user to the Palm

section of the US Robotics web server would be stored in a base HTML document as <LINK HREF="http://www.usr.conmpalm">'. With some of the longer path names that are present on the web, it is easy to see how large these hot link references can become.

The “roughly 500 bytes” that the Examiner referenced in the outstanding Office Action refers, as admitted by the Examiner, to typical web page content, not a hot link. Moreover, as explicitly described by Hawkins above, and commensurate with Applicant’s interpretation, a hot link is merely another URL link that is placed within an existing webpage that has it’s own URL address, hence the name “hot link.” Putting hot links in an existing webpage merely allow a browser to access the content stored, e.g., at another server by clicking on the hot link, instead of independently going to that other server via a different webpage associated with that other server. Therefore, as suggested by the Examiner, Hawkins describes the modification of information in a source document, e.g., a particular URL address associated with that document (e.g., a source webpage URL address), which results in the same change in the destination document (e.g., the webpage containing the hot link representing the source webpage URL address). Hence, a hot link cannot be analogous to actual content, e.g., the claimed “further content linked” recited in claim 43 of the present application.

In other words, and in contrast to Hawkins, claim 43 of the present application requires that first content is retrieved from the server simultaneously with further content linked to the first content. That is, claim 43 of the present application requires the retrieval of two groups of content, e.g., the first content and the further content that is linked to the first content. This is entirely different from simply transmitting a first content and compressed hyperlinks (such as hot links) within that first content. As described in Applicant’s previously filed response of May 22, 2007, which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, various embodiments described in the present application facilitate user browsing when the communication device is not connected to a network, where further downloading of content (e.g., link content, further content linked) related to the already downloaded content (e.g., first content) is not necessary. (*See, e.g.*, page 4, lines 8-12, page 15, line 23-page 16, line 15, and page 22, lines 21-23 of the present application). Contrary to the Examiner’s interpretation of Hawkins, a hot link is not actual content but, as described above, merely

another URL link. Therefore, Hawkins requires that further downloading is performed even when utilizing hot links.

Because none of the references cited by the Examiner, either separately or in combination with each other, teach fetching and/or sending first content and link content simultaneously, Applicant submits that each of independent claims 24, 32, 36, 43, 47, 51, 53, 56, and 58 are patentable over this prior art. Furthermore, because dependent claims 25-31, 33-35, 37-42, 44-46, 48-50, 52, 54, 55, 57, and 59 are each directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claims 24, 32, 36, 43, 47, 51, 53, 56, and 58, Applicant submits that each of these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 26, 2007

By /G. Peter Albert Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268